

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The outstanding Office Action stated the Oath/Declaration was defective because it does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. Additionally, certain informality of objections to the specification were noted. Further, claims 1-6, 8 and 10 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,406,505 (Oh et al.); claims 1, 3-6, 8 and 10 were rejected as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by US-2003/0066156A1 (Yang); and claims 2 and 7 were rejected as obvious over the '156 Yang patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,944,780 (Usnani).

The Office Action did, however, indicate that while claim 9 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the signed Declaration of record is proper and not defective. In that regard, the Declaration of record contains the complete residential address including street, city and country for each of the co-inventors and the Official Filing Receipt for this application specifies the city and country of residence, namely Glasgow, United Kingdom, for each of the co-inventors.

Concerning the formal objections to the specification, by the present Amendment, applicants have amended the Specification to include an Abstract and to update the identification of the U.S. patent application references noted in paragraph 33. Additionally, the informality with respect to claim 1 has been addressed in the present Amendment of claim 1.


Application No. 10/817,597  
Amdt. Dated February 14, 2006  
Reply to Office Action dated September 15, 2005

Applicants appreciate the indication that claim 9, while objected to as dependent from a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 9 was dependent upon independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3 and 4. To expedite prosecution of the present application, applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the features present in claims 3, 4 and 9.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that applicants have addressed and overcome each of the issues raised by the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

COOK, ALEX, MC FARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

By   
David Lesht, Reg. No. 30,472

200 West Adams Street  
Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

February 14, 2006